		Application No.		Applicant(s)		
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summa	201	10/708,658		HERDMAN, RODRICK A.		
Examiner-initiated interview Summary		Examiner		Art Unit		
		Lloyd A. Gall		3676		
All Participants:		Status of Applicati	ion:	_		
(1) <i>Lloyd A. Gall</i> .		(3)				
(2) <u>Daniel F. Nesbitt</u> .		(4)				
Date of Interview: <u>1 February 2007</u>		Time:				
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes If Yes, provide a brief description:		ant's representative)				
Part I.						
Rejection(s) discussed:						
					·	
Claims discussed:						
Prior art documents discussed:						
Part II.						
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING TH See Continuation Sheet	IE GENE	RAL NATURE OF WHA	AT WAS	DISCUSSED:		
Part III.						
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a s directly resulted in the allowance of the applicant the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a s did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief 	ation. The eparate	e examiner will provide record of the substance	e a writter e of the in	n summary of the nterview, since	ne substance	
					<u>. </u>	
(F)	• "					
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applican	t/Applicant's Represent	atıve Sigi	nature – it appro	opriate)	

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Gall questioned the double bracket location in claim 6, line 10, and Mr. Nesbitt confirmed that the double bracket was intended to be located after "position" in claim 6, line 9. It was agreed that the claim should be examined with the line 9 location in mind, and that Mr. Nesbitt would correct the location in the next response.